

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 in the manner discussed during the telephone interview on July 23, 2008, and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suda et al. (US 2003/0051794) taken alone, or further in view of Hitotsuyanagi et al. (US 2002/0046796).

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the distributing means distribute the reinforcing material to the first conveying path and the second conveying path at an initial orientation, the *first conveying path is twisted* so that a reinforcing material exit of the first conveying path *is inclined with respect to the initial orientation*, and the *second conveying path is twisted* so that a reinforcing material exit of the second conveying path *is inclined in a direction opposite* the reinforcing material exit of the first conveying path.

This amendment is supported in the original specification at least by the exemplary embodiment discussed at the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 and shown in FIG. 3. By this configuration, the device of claim 1 has the advantageous effect in that it does not require

rotation of the conveying path to provide plural belt layers having cords that extend in intersecting directions, in contrast to devices in the prior art.¹

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 at least because there is no reasonable combination of Suda and Hitotsuyanagi that would meet every recitation of the amended claim.

That is, the neither Suda nor Hitosuyanagi discloses first and second conveying paths that are *twisted* so that the reinforcing material exits that are *inclined in opposite directions*. As discussed during the telephone interview, the path through Suda's guide rollers 236, 238 in *is not twisted*.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 3 at least because of its dependency from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

¹ See, for example, the exemplary embodiment at FIG. 3 in which the reinforcing material 12A is guided in opposing inclinations, in addition to the different orientations.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/543,192

Attorney Docket No.: Q89294

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

Date: August 7, 2008